

Narratives of war, narratives of the individual: The living and the dead soldier in the first and latest media wars.

Gerry Beegan

This essay examines changing visual narratives of warfare and focuses on the South African or Boer War of 1899 to 1902, which was both the first major industrialized war and also the first media war. It looks at the way in which changing technologies of imaging and reproduction were deployed within new structures of publishing, and how this was pivotal in a reshaping of narrative. As modern warfare became increasingly complex, the media seized on the image of the individual soldier rather than attempting to depict the larger situation. Despite this emphasis on the individual's subjective experience of warfare the British press rarely depicted, for reasons of patriotism and decency, the catastrophic effects of war on the individual, their mental and physical transformation by injury or their effacement by death.

The essay uses this investigation of the first media war as a means of examining some aspects of the current conflict in Iraq. I suggest that the approaches to the journalistic narrative of war which were in place in 1900 have persisted through to the reporting of the latest media war. The characteristics and individual stories of the common soldier are the implicit or explicit hub of American press and television reports. At the same time the potential fate of the common soldier, his or her violent mutilation or death, is dealt with in a most perfunctory manner. Both the press and the government censor images of the dead, who most commonly appear as bald lists of

names, ranks, and home states. The maimed and crippled, who vastly outnumber the dead, are almost totally invisible, there are no lists or images. There is a stark contrast between the intense visibility and individualizing of soldiers while they are alive and their exclusion and invisibility on their injury or destruction. These contradictory tendencies became apparent in the reporting of the South African War, though I will discuss some differences between the journalism of the two eras. War has, for instance, become even more of a visual spectacle abetted by digital technologies, satellite communications, and cable news networks.

The Boer War was a disastrous Imperial adventure, an attempt to control scarce resources, and a marker of Britain's decline as the world's industrial and political leader. ¹ It was the most costly war fought by Britain in the nineteenth century, both in monetary terms and in terms of loss of life. Twenty two thousand British soldiers died, with twenty five thousand fatalities on the Boer side and twelve thousand African deaths. The encounter was covered by a greater number of image makers than any previous conflict. There were more illustrators at the front than ever before but there were also press photographers, soldiers with Kodak cameras, and even filmmakers. As daily newspapers were still unable to print images the weekly illustrated press had a monopoly in visualizing the distant conflict for an eager public. ²

This was an intensely visible war, and its coverage in the illustrated press ushered in a new phase in the reporting of warfare. ³ Photo-relief techniques which reduced the cost and increased the speed of both line and tonal images became the norm in the periodical from the mid 1890s onwards. There was an explosion of photography in

the press. ⁴ In the first six months of 1900 Joseph Elliot of Elliot and Fry, a major portrait firm, made the then considerable sum of £2,000 from press images associated with the war. There was a huge demand for photographs of high ranking military figures and the firm made £500 from one image of Baden-Powell, the commander who became the most visible media personality of the war. ⁵

The changing styles of war reporting need to be seen in the context of the newly aestheticized and personalized journalism of the 1890s. The press' emphasis on human interest and illustration set the tone for much of the popular journalism which followed. During the 1890s the British media was dramatically transformed by the growth of large publishing corporations. These press conglomerates produced popular illustrated magazines for a mass audience. For the first time these magazines were financially dependent on advertising. They sold access to their readership to manufacturers who were, also for the first time, attempting to control the distribution and consumption of mass produced goods. The magazines aimed to please, entertain, and attract individual readers, rather than to preach a political or social message as in the past. Indeed, in order to attract large readerships magazines avoided contentious political comment in favor of a middle of the road, supposedly objective stance. The new illustrated magazine was ostensibly a depoliticized, neutral space. This neutrality, which was epitomized by the supposedly factual image, was intended to appeal to as wide a section of the middle class readership as possible. ⁶

These changes in the media related to individuality and subjectivity in various ways. The content of the press dealt with the personal qualities of individuals, their

character and the details of their lives, feelings, ideas and appearance.⁷ At the same time the mass produced magazine needed to appeal to the individual reader, a reader who was now addressed as a consumer by the magazines' illustrated advertising. In addition, the mass periodical's tone had become more personal, conversational and intimate.⁸ Journalists as purveyors of gossip and opinion became visible and assertive personalities within the pages of the magazines. This fragmented, sensationalist, human interest journalism was identified as the 'new journalism', a phrase which was first used by Matthew Arnold in 1887.⁹ The illustrated new journalism of the 1890s emphasized the subjective aspects of modernity and through photography and sketches was able to make the individual visible in a heightened manner. Indeed, the illustrated magazine was at the same time an indication of the centrality of visibility to modernity, and also a means of producing that visibility.

By the end of the century the journalistic structures were in place to represent warfare in a new fashion. Illustrated magazines such as *The King*, which was launched in January 1900 by the Newnes conglomerate, took the approaches of new journalism to war. In the increasingly depoliticised press personality, rather than class, politics, or economic forces shaped society and press coverage of the war concentrated on individual character, whether that was the character of the generals or of the troops or the enemy. In the press the major figures in the war were all known by familiar nicknames: the British commander Lord Roberts was known as "Bobs," Baden Powell, the hero of Mafeking, was "B.P." and the common soldier was known collectively as "Tommy".¹⁰

From the early days of illustrated journalism in the 1840s war had been an important element in the weekly magazines' success. The major British magazines of the second half of the century, such as the *Illustrated London News* and *The Graphic* went to considerable expense to provide readers with visual and written reports of conflicts. For over fifty years the demand for images of battle had been met by on the spot illustrators called "Special Artists" who sent sketches from the war zone back to London for completion. With the onset of the war in the Cape there was a flood of images from the front and the quality of photographic reproduction improved dramatically over the course of the conflict. The apparent directness of the photo-relief processes attested in a powerful way to photographers' and illustrators' presence with the troops. The major illustrated magazines all sent illustrators and photographers as well as reporters to cover the conflict. Pearson's, one of the three main media conglomerates, claimed that it had 50 photographers and artists in South Africa.¹¹

These journalists' expectations of what the war would look like were based on images of previous conflicts, or on their experience in other wars. Those who covered the campaign anticipated that it would be dramatic and picturesque, full of heroic and exciting deeds, but warfare had changed. Accurate long range artillery, submachine guns, and rifles with telescopic sights had transformed the conduct and appearance of battle. Newly amalgamated systems of surveillance and communication; searchlights, balloons, binoculars, signals, gun sights, telephoto lenses, cameras, telegraph, motor cars, and bicycles enabled troops to be assembled, and controlled, to kill and be killed over large areas.¹² Vision was, therefore, at the heart of the

conflict. The aim of the combatants was to see the enemy while remaining out of sight. This war of concealment and scientific calculation was not, therefore, very visually exciting. Not only were the armies drab, with the British troops dressed in khaki rather than scarlet, but the battles, when they took place at all, were usually fought at great distances.¹³ Yet there were audiences and organizations back home to be supplied with images.

Representations of the war were not simply determined by the technological limitations of the camera, or the imaginations of Special Artists. Even the circumstances of this particular campaign were not the decisive factor. Both photographers and illustrators were working within established conventions of how warfare should be depicted. These standards were based on previous images in the press, on prints, and on paintings of battle. The expectation was that images of war should be stirring, positive and patriotic. Despite some dissenting voices there was a prevalent attitude that, although war was bloody, it brought out man's valorous qualities. This view, inculcated all the way from school text books to the press, asserted that war was, in the final analysis, ennobling and depictions of armed conflict were therefore expected to inspire.

These expectations were embodied in the large numbers of "battle paintings" which were a popular feature of Royal Academy exhibitions.¹⁴ The conventions of battle painting, while they maintained their positive attitude, were evolving. From the 1880s military painters stopped showing the panoramic views of entire engagements which had been the norm and increasingly focussed on incidents within battles. Minor events

and distinct figures were brought to the fore. The individual soldier, or small groups of soldiers, rendered in accurate detail, became the most common subject matter.¹⁵

These changes in painting were due, in part, to the influence of the press illustrations of conflict. In the 1840s “realistic” paintings of battle had been criticized as inartistic. However, in response to the regular journalistic depiction of warfare in *The Graphic* and *The Illustrated London News* battle paintings became more detailed and documentary in nature.¹⁶ Special Artists could not claim the omniscience of the large scale battle painter, rather they were expected to be eye witnesses. In practice they were rarely able to observe military action at close quarters and Specials often relied on second hand accounts. Their assertion of credibility had to be bolstered by the faithful depiction of the surface details of military uniform and equipment. In addition, the scale of the magazine encouraged a more fragmentary treatment of events, it lent itself to the intimate rather than the panoramic.¹⁷

These images operated within wider expectations of what it was appropriate to show. Factuality, critics argued, should be tempered by discretion, as audiences did not want to see disturbingly realistic, “sensationalist” images of war.¹⁸ The press images of the Boer War operated largely within these existing ideologies as image makers conformed to expectations of what should and could be visualized.¹⁹ There was, therefore, an almost complete absence of the defining images of war, the wounded and the dead. There were some drawings of bodies on battlefields, but few photographs.²⁰ There were a larger number of depictions of the injured, of burials, and of graves as a means of honoring the fallen. On one occasion *The King* reproduced

Boer photographs of British corpses after the Battle of Spion Kop. These had been supplied to the press by Winston Churchill, a young war correspondent who was keen to make a name for himself.²¹ The photographs were captioned "The Horrors of War" and *The King* justified their publication on the grounds that they demonstrated the serious nature of the conflict to those who made light of the campaign.²²

For many viewers, photographs such as these were too realistic, they gave an excess of detail, and brought the reader disturbingly close to the war. A.C.R. Carter in his survey of the images from South Africa characterized the drawing as superior to the uncompromising and sensationalist photograph. This was because it could steer a more tasteful path through the carnage and depict the stirring and the improving side of battle. Carter was relieved that illustrators had refused to sensationalize or dramatize the conflict, and had instead shown the stoical, everyday heroism of the ordinary soldier. Carter repeated throughout his exhaustive survey that he did not wish to discuss the issues of the war, or join in debates about its conduct. His subject, and the subject of the artists themselves, was the personal qualities of the ordinary soldier. In another essay Carter asserted that the illustrator and battle painter Caton Woodville: "... sets down all the stolidity, eagerness, coolness, and self-sacrifice incarnated in Tommy Atkins. Each face here is national; it is the face of a British hero, and happily for us as a nation it can be recognized at home in the face of the man in the street. "²³ These illustrations emphasized the fact that the soldier was essentially an everyday character, someone we might encounter, relocated to the front. But he wasn't just Everyman, he was an Briton.²⁴ The narrative of the individual

merged with the narrative of the nation and provided a reassuring story of national unity.

Photography further emphasized the normality of the combatants. Photographers depicted the individual soldier engaged, not in acts of heroism, but in the everyday events of military life. No photographs of fighting seem to have been reproduced in the press, despite the many promises and claims made by the magazines. Photographs which purported to show combat have a stilted, posed appearance and there are recorded incidences of photographers faking battle pictures. Photographers were, understandably, disinclined to risk their lives photographing battles, and were unwilling to show their bloody aftermath. Therefore, the photographic images which appeared in the press mainly consisted of portraits, marches, and parades as well as images of camp life, of troops cooking, washing, and relaxing.²⁵

This repetitive photographic coverage also produced a comforting narrative of national harmony, and showed a society organized along familiar class lines. The relations and structures established at home were simply transposed to the Veldt. The pictures of camp life showed workers, overseers, and managers pulling together for the national good.²⁶ The deployment of photomechanical technologies in the mass market magazine, allowed for the reiteration of image tropes on an intensified scale. On the one hand these photographic halftones depicted the individual experience of the war. Yet, at the same time the repetitive structure of the magazine robbed the images of their individuality. Indeed, it was as if the photographic reproduction of the war echoed the depersonalization of industrialized warfare. The easily captured and

easily reproduced photograph was ideally suited to the depiction of a war in which the individual soldier had, in reality, become an interchangeable, disposable element in the calculations of military planners.²⁷

One way of making this dull war more thrilling was through the personalizing of the reporting itself. In the new journalism of the 1890s the character of the correspondents themselves came to the fore. The reporter was no longer simply an anonymous transcriber of factual information, but had become the reader's representative with a personality and opinions of their own. As such, their own subjective reactions to the events they reported became a significant element in the press. The accounts that the Special Artists and Special Correspondents sent back to London were not merely about the war, but about their experience of the campaign. Melton Prior, the *Illustrated London News's* senior Special Artist included himself in his drawings so often that he was said to be the most visible personality of the conflict, aside from the leading generals.²⁸

The British press corps in South Africa were totally involved with, and dependent upon, the armed forces.²⁹ Reporters were "embedded" with regiments; they were treated as officers, dressed in military uniform, provided with forage for their horses, and placed under martial law. They were also dependent on the military for their information, as most were unfamiliar with the country, the local populace and even the complexities of the war itself. Many Special Artists were, like Prior, patriotic, imperialist, and completely identified with the military perspective on the war. They therefore internally censored their reports. Never the less, the authorities were not

prepared to take any risks as warfare was now a huge logistical and industrial undertaking encompassing the human and economic resources of the British Empire. The visualizing of the conflict to those back in England was an important element in connecting the "home front" with the conflict in South Africa, and the military imposed a strict censorship on imagery. Photographs and illustrations had to be submitted to the censor who stamped them before they were sent by ship to England.³⁰ The American magazine *Harper's* criticized this system of surveillance and news management in which correspondents become, in essence, an adjunct of the army.³¹

There was a great deal of media attention on South Africa, and high expectations of an Imperial victory. In the absence of dramatic incidents the press and the military conspired to create stories that would appease the public's desire for action, success and heroism. The exaggerated and distorted press coverage, by Prior and others, of the essentially boring sieges of Mafeking, Ladysmith and Kimberly turned them into Victorian epics of endurance and pluck.³² Press reports, photographs and illustrations made Baden Powell, the commander of the garrison at Mafeking, into a national hero.

Lord Roberts, who took command of the British forces in January 1900, proved to be an expert in handling the press and controlled coverage, not by overt and aggressive censorship but by news management. Photo-opportunities, as we now call them, were planned so that photographers and correspondents could record them. "Bobs" held his staff meetings out of doors so that they could be more easily photographed, and parades were re-routed for the benefit of the press. The military and an

acquiescent media collaborated in the manufacture of staged visual events, meetings, marches, official surrenders and entrances into captured towns, all of which perpetuated a narrative of organization, discipline and grit.³³

However, certain individuals were left out of the media's chronicle of the war. The war involved not only British and Boer forces but also troops from the British Empire, and Irish and American volunteers fighting on the Boer side. Some of these groups were depicted, but the black population who fought and died in their thousands were largely invisible. Blacks were useful as comic relief in stories, and correspondents were dependent on African runners to carry texts and images through enemy lines. Yet, the starvation of the black population in Mafeking by Baden Powell was simply not reported by the press.

After an unprecedented interest in the early stages of the war press coverage had faded by mid-1900. Combat had moved into a long guerilla phase with few dramatic incidents or victories to stir the readers back home. In June of that year *The Sphere* compared the war to a theatrical spectacle and complained "to use the vulgar but expressive term it is 'fizzling out' in a manner which would ensure a more than 'mixed reception' for the author of a new play".³⁴ The press had attempted to construct a dramatic account of the campaign, but events refused to fit the story.

The scale and nature of modern industrialized war was beyond clarification and comprehension within the structures of new journalism. Indeed the visual, which had become so important in the press, could convey only a small part of the conflict. The

events at the front were the outcome of meetings, decisions, bureaucracies, experiments and patents, contracts and assembly lines, none of which were very photogenic. In the face of the abstraction of technological war image makers turned to the individual soldier, the most comprehensible and visible element. The image of the soldier, even if they were pictured on a march or taking part in the quotidian events of camp life carried with it in implicit and compelling personal narrative. These stories fitted neatly within the newly developing tropes of the emerging mass media.

What then has changed and what has remained the same between the first media war and the latest? The image now occupies an even greater space at the heart of the conflict, the ubiquity and mobility of digital video and digital photography has further heightened the visibility of the individual. This has been a war of images, from the photographs of Abu Ghraib, to trophy photographs of prisoners taken by British troops, to the images of Saddam Hussein on his capture in December 2003 and in prison in May 2005.³⁵

Once again we can see the emphasis on individual anecdote and narrative being placed at the heart of the reporting of the war. A typical story from *The San Francisco Chronicle* "Tikrit neighborhood gets rude awakening" is a narrative of pre-dawn raids on homes which makes a feature of the banter and comradeship of the troops. The report details the names, ages, ranks and hometowns of the American soldiers involved.³⁶ Indeed, the stoical qualities of those around her is exactly what a reporter is likely to appreciate in a strange and potentially menacing situation. However, the account provided by this style of "embedded" reporting is very partial, in both senses

of the word. In press reports the character of the troops, the generals and the politicians become the decisive factors in the conflict. These individuals are visible, and graspable and a narrative can be shaped around them. At the same time the less easily visualized social and economic forces which are central to understanding the crisis in the Middle East are not given the same number of column inches or minutes of airtime.

The embedded American press were, on the whole, in shock and awe at the might of the US forces in the initial stages of the conflict. As in the Boer War the reporters became part of the story. Indeed, the presentation of a piece to camera by a newsman in khaki, wearing body armor is inherently dramatic and compelling. When they crouch down at a nearby explosion the viewer ducks too. Also, as in the Boer War, the military have manufactured incidents for the media, who have collaborated in the distribution and uncritical circulation of these fabrications. The most notable of these are the Jessica Lynch rescue narrative and the toppling of Saddam Hussein's statue in Paradise Square.

A notable difference in the reporting of the two conflict is that the invisibility of the dead soldier is even more intense in Iraq than it was in 1900. Whereas the press of 1900 was able to call on the illustration to show death and burial in an acceptable and respectful way the photographic or televisual depiction of these events has proved unacceptable for social and political reasons. There are many images of Iraqi dead and wounded lying in the street in the aftermath of explosions or in hospital, and of course there are large numbers of Iraqi casualties to photograph.³⁷

In the American media US military losses are most commonly recorded as a brief list of names, ranks, and home states. The deaths of soldiers are not reported in the major news sections of the paper, but in the local coverage.³⁸ In doing so they are turned into individual tragedies, and their connection to an international catastrophe is concealed. This concealment relates to the US Government's efforts to aesthetically sanitize the human consequences of the war, through, for instance, trying to censor images of military funerals. A legal battle to have photographs of the arrival and transfer of coffins at Dover Air Base released eventually succeeded in April 2005 when the Pentagon were forced to publish over 700 images. However, the anonymity of the dead was preserved, few details were given, and even the faces of the pall bearers blacked out, supposedly for reasons of privacy.

The differences between the web sites of the US Department of Defense and the UK Ministry of Defense are telling in this respect. The Department of Defense site offers no names or images of the dead or injured. A chart within the site simply tallies the latest figures for KIA (troops killed in action) and WIA (troops wounded in action)³⁹ In the place of specifics the site offers platitudes such as "All gave some but some gave all." Who the some are, and what they gave is not detailed. The British Ministry of Defense site, by way of contrast, gives prominence to photographs of military funerals, portraits of dead troops, and accounts of their lives and deaths. Of course, the numbers of these fatalities are much lower, as Britain is very much the junior partner in the Iraq invasion.⁴⁰ Never the less, the presence of images of funerals, in both official sites and in the British media, demonstrates a respect for the

dead which is a continuation of the Boer War coverage. However, as in the Boer War coverage, images of the dead or injured British soldier, on the battle field or in hospital are rare. The image of the individual and the individual narrative fits comfortably within the structures of the contemporary media, as they did in the emerging mass media of 1900. Yet, there are severe limits to the realism of these narratives, and to the extent to which they are willing to follow the stories of the troops through to their sometimes tragic end.

¹ On the war in general see Warwick, P. (1980). The South African War: The Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902. Harlow, Longman. On the photographic imagery of war see Brothers, C. (1997). War and Photography: A Cultural History. London, Routledge. also see Hüppauf, B. (1995). Modernism and the Photographic Representation of War and Destruction. Fields of Vision: Essays on Film Studies, Visual Anthropology and Photography. L. Hillman. Berkeley, University of California Press: 94-124. for a criticism of humanistic depictions of warfare. On war correspondents and Special Artists see Knightly, P. (1975). The First Casualty: The war correspondent as hero, propagandist and myth maker. London, Quartet. Carruthers, J. (1987). Melton Prior: War Artist in South Africa. Houghton, Brenthurst Press. For contemporary accounts by war correspondents and illustrators in South Africa see Lynch, G. (1903). Impressions of a War Correspondent. London, George Newnes. Menpes, M. (1901). War Impressions. London, Charles Black. Dickson, W. (1901). The Biograph in Battle: Its Story in The South African War Related with Personal Experiences. London, T. Fisher Unwin.

² The Illustrated Press Bureau, one of the first photographic agencies appealed to military officers to send them their negatives which they will then develop, print and submit for publication. Ward, H. S., Catharine Weed Ward (1901). Photography for the Press. London, Dawbarn and Ward.

³ J. A. Hobson Imperialism: A study (1965) argued that the Boer War had been turned into a series of spectacular events in the sensational press. Brantlinger, P. (1985). Bread and Circuses: Theories of Mass Culture as Social Decay. Ithica, Cornell University Press. p 143

⁴ Many magazines were launched to capitalize on interest in the war which were illustrated almost entirely by photographs these included *The Transvall Special*, *The War Illustrated*, *Under the Union Jack*, and *With the Flag in Pretoria*.

⁵ This must have been a large number of images as Elliot charged between ten shillings and sixpence and a guinea per image. On Elliot see "Copyright and the American Photographer", *The Photo Beacon*, XII 10. October 1900 275-277 *The Illustrated London News'* assistant editor J. D. Symon recalled that photographic agents first became common with the South African War. Symon, J. D. (1914). The Press and its Story. London, Seeley, Service and Co.

⁶ The journalistic approaches developed in the illustrated weeklies were transferred to the newspaper press in the later 1890s as the press conglomerates of Pearson, Newnes and Harmworth launched or bought daily newspapers.

The inaugural editorial of *The Sphere*, one of the many magazines which were founded after the outbreak of the war, suggests the parameters within which this impartiality operated:

"In the region of religious and political controversy *The Sphere* will be neutral. It will leave to the daily and non-illustrated press the discussion of the great problems affecting many sides of life. *The Sphere* will deal with actualities, it will show things as they are, not as they may be. But its watchword will be loyalty to the Queen and the Empire, its note a profound sense of the infinite power for good of Great and Greater Britain, and a deep reverence for the noble Sovereign, who, for more than sixty

years, has ruled with so much dignity and charm over a world-wide realm." *The Sphere* Vol. 1 no 1 Jan 27 1900 'Our Watchword; For Queen and Empire' p 3

⁷ "Modern popular journalism, reckoning from the foundation of the picture press in the 1890s, located the public domain not in the practice of democratic politics but in personal bonds and domestic ties of the populace." Hartley, J. (1992). *The Politics of Pictures*. London, Routledge.

⁸ It is significant that the emphasis on individuality and personality in the illustrated new journalism occurred at the same time as the publishing industry was increasingly controlled by large corporations. The intimate tone of these periodicals acted to conceal the growing scale and anonymity of a publishing industry which was concerned primarily with profit. As Richard Salmon suggests, 'It is surely not coincidental that at the very moment when the material basis of the press made it harder to locate an individual source of authorial value, the discourse of journalism should so insistently declare its personalized character.' Salmon, R. 'A Simulacrum of Power': Intimacy and Abstraction in the Rhetoric of the New Journalism. *Nineteenth Century Media and the Construction of Identities*, ed. L. Brake, Palgrave: 27-39. 29 On this relationship see also Jackson, K. "The Tit Bits Phenomenon: George Newnes, New Journalism and Periodical Texts." *VPR* 30 : 201-226.24

⁹ This was in a criticism of W. T. Stead, the editor of *The Pall Mall Gazette*. The editorial features of New Journalism, the fragmentary treatment of human interest material were not new and had been in place before the 1880s. What was new in the 1890s was the bringing together of these elements in a more varied visual format with a greater use of illustrations. Raymond Williams states of this period 'From now on the new journalism began to look like what it was.' Williams, R. (1961). *The Long Revolution*. London, Chatto And Windus.198

¹⁰ In his "Barrack Room Ballads" Rudyard Kipling had christened the anonymous soldier "Tommy Atkins", or "Tommy"

¹¹ On Pearson see Johnson, P. (1978). *Front Line Artists*. London, Cassell.

¹² *The Sketch* Oct 11, 1899 War in South Africa notes that all the resources of modern science, machine guns, motor cars, bicycles, telegraph would be used in the conflict.

¹³ At the beginning of the decade Skinner noted the increasingly long range nature of warfare, with skirmishes at a distance rather than hand to hand combat. The enemy was rarely in the picture and it was difficult for artists to convey the noise of the unseen bullet or shell. Skinner suggested that illustrators depict incidents on the fringe of the action, touching incidents which were 'almost historical' It was much easier to get all of the details in a small incident involving a couple of soldiers than to try and record a major event that was, nevertheless, over very quickly. He concluded that it was better to observe the many small but telling incidents. Skinner, H. (1892). War Artists and Battle Pictures. *Magazine of Art*. 15: 62-64. 64

¹⁴ On the attitude of Sir William Ingram, publisher of the *Illustrated London News* see Caton Woodville, R. (1914). *Random Recollections*. London, Eveleigh Nash.

¹⁵ The popularity of the "human interest" genres of military painting, increased in the 1880s. These paintings showed the individual and personal aspects of army life; scenes of recruitment, of homecoming, and of veterans. For the new emphasis on the individual in military painting see Hichberger, J. W. M. (1988). *Images of the Army: The Military in British Art 1815-1914*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

¹⁶ The war correspondent Charles Williams noted that in the past no one expected the battle paintings of Lady Butler to be realistic. Now that has changed as special artists were sent to give an accurate visual report from the front. Williams, Charles (1896). Battle Pictures *Magazine of Art* 19 346-347

¹⁷ See Herkomer on the more intimate scale of magazine illustration. Herkomer, H. (1908). *My School and my Gospel*. London, Archibald Constable and Co.

¹⁸ A battle picture should be suggestive of the horror of war, but should not actually show it. This would be too off-putting. Skinner, H. (1892). War Artists and Battle Pictures. *Magazine of Art*. 15: 62-64.

¹⁹ Modern battle artists and "illustrated artists" including Melton Prior, and Villiers show the picturesque individual human details of the campaign not the 'tremendous charges' that used to be shown. *Ibid*.

²⁰ Jobling and Crowley refer to the 'visual etiquette' which distanced the reader from the horror of a sensational event by depicting it through a wood cut drawing rather than through a photograph. Drawn images of war, disaster and poverty were acceptable when photographs would not have been. Jobling,

P. a. D. C. (1996). Graphic design : reproduction and representation since 1800. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

²¹ Churchill became a celebrity because of his reports of his own exploits as a correspondent. On the basis of this and the money he made from his reporting he laid the foundations of his political career.

²² 'The Horrors of War' *The King* 1.17 April 28 1900 p 57

²³ Carter, A. C. R. (1900). The Work of the War Artists in South Africa. The Art Annual for 1900: Xmas Number of the Art Journal. **62 NS**: 1-32. ²⁴ Given the fact that Woodville was a London-based artist it certainly was the face of the man in the street who appeared in his paintings. The image Carter was referring to was entitled 'In the Trenches at Ladysmith'. *The Spear* dubbed Woodville 'The Kipling of the Brush' *The Spear* 6 1900, 26, 27

²⁴ *Ibid.* 25

²⁵ See Carlebach, Michael L. (1997) American Photojournalism Comes of Age Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press on the difficulties for photographers in actually recording fighting in the Spanish-American War the year before this. Instead they showed images of troops on the march, generals discussing strategy, men sheltering from fire and of artillery in action. These were very popular. See Keller on the staging and manipulation of early photographic news coverage. Keller, U. F. (1990). Photojournalism Around 1900: The Institutionalization of a Mass Medium. Shadow and Substance. K. Collins. Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, Amorphous Institute: 283-303.

²⁶ See Taylor, J. L. (1991). War Photography: Realism in the British Press. London, Routledge. on WW1 recreation of factories at the front.

²⁷ 'A Scottish Battle Artist' *The Spear* Feb 7 1900 1.3 100-101

²⁸ Johnson, P. (1978). Front Line Artists. London, Cassell.

²⁹ See Pedelty, M. (1995). War Stories: The Culture of Foreign Correspondents. NY, Routledge. for the relations between the press corps and the military in more recent conflicts. His picture of the war correspondent who projects a macho identity while keeping well away from danger seems very apposite to Victorian practices. He notes that correspondents rather than being lone individuals mainly congregate in groups waiting for information. Their access to this information is strictly controlled through passes. The rituals of parades are planned well in advance so that they can be filmed. He sees war coverage as a re-animation of the 'meta narratives of society.'

³⁰ On the censorship of the war see McKensie, F. A. (1900). English War Correspondents in South Africa. Harper's Monthly. **602**: 209-216.

³¹ See Jussim, E. (1988). The Tyranny of the Pictorial: American Photojournalism from 1880 to 1920. Eyes of Time: Photojournalism in America. M. Fulton. New York, New York Graphic Society: 37-74. 63-64 on the censorship of photographers in WW1

³² On the creation of the Boer War siege myths see Sibbald, R. (1993). The War Correspondents: The Boer War. Stroud, Alan Sutton. Mortimer Menpes, a dissenting Australian illustrator, stated that he feasted on chicken, butter and champagne in Kimberley and found no trace of hardship or destruction. Menpes, M. (1901). War Impressions. London, Charles Black.

³³ See Johnson, P. (1978). Front Line Artists. London, Cassell.

³⁴ *The Sphere* 1900 June 9th 620 On the lack of interest in latter stages of the war see Blanch, M. D. (1980). British Society and the War. The South African War: The Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902. P. Warwich. Harlow, Longman.

³⁵ See Peter Beaumont, Paul Harris and Antony Barnett, (2005) Inside secret Saddam prison The Observer Sunday May 22

³⁶ Anna Badkhen, San Francisco Chronicle, June 10, 20005 pp A1, A12

³⁷ For sensationalist photographs of Iraq dead see "The blood and guts of a suicide bombing" Anna Badkhen, San Francisco Chronicle, June 14, 20005 A1, A10. Data on Iraqi deaths is very hard to come by, the US claim they don't keep a tally. The organization The Iraq Body Count keeps a database compiled from media reports which includes figures for Iraqi civilians and members of the police force who have been killed by all sides. As of June 2005 their estimate was between 22,111 and 25,076 Civilian Iraq deaths since the beginning of hostilities. More details are available at iraqbodycount.net. Most of these remain anonymous, though there are instances where their deaths are more remarkable, for example the photographs of Saddam Hussein's dead sons and the video of a US marine killing a wounded and unarmed Iraqi in a Falluja mosque in November 2004. See "US military

backs marine over filmed Falluja mosque shooting”, Suzanne Goldenberg and Michael Howard, *The Guardian*, Friday May 6, 2005

³⁸ For an example see Henry K. Lee “Stockton, Special Forces soldier killed in Afghanistan.” *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 14, 2005, B3.

³⁹ The only names, portraits and biographies which are prominent on the Department of Defense web site are those of the military top brass, the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The casualty figures are tucked away at www.defencelink.mil/news/casualty.pdf As of June 10 2005 the somewhat out of date figures posted were total deaths 1,685, 1293 of these were KIA, another 393 were “Non-Hostile” deaths. Of the wounded 6,454 had RTD (returned to duty) within 72 hours, 6,407 had not.

Apart from these casualties there are many more injuries which are literally invisible. *The New England Journal of Medicine* found that mental health problems, from major depress to post traumatic stress disorder, had effected 15.6 to 17.1 percent of returned troops. The survey found higher levels of mental disorder in Iraq than Afghanistan, and also found that sufferers were unlikely to admit to their problems or to seek help. See “Combat Duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, Mental Health Problems, and Barriers to Care”, Charles W. Hoge, M.D., Carl A. Castro, Ph.D., Stephen C. Messer, Ph.D., Dennis McGurk, Ph.D., Dave I. Cotting, Ph.D., and Robert L. Koffman, M.D., M.P.H. *New England Journal of Medicine*, Volume 351, Number 1, July 1, 2004, 13-22

⁴⁰ Less than one hundred British troops have died as of June 2005. For an example of the Ministry of Defense’s coverage of deaths see

http://news.mod.uk/news/press/news_headline_story.asp?newsItem_id=3265 “Death of British Serviceman in Iraq - Lance Corporal Alan Brackenbury” which features photographs, an account of the dead soldier’s character, military service and death as well as quotations from his father and commanding officer. This was published on 29th May 2005